

**REMARKS**

***Status of the Application***

Claims 1-15 are all the claims pending in the application.

***Formal Matters***

Applicant conducted a telephone interview with the Examiner on February 12, 2009, and received a copy of the Examiner's Interview Summary on February 17, 2009. Concurrent with this Response, Applicant has submitted the required Statement of Substance of Interview.

***Claim Rejections: 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) - Shima***

Claims 1-10 and 14-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by US Publication No. 2002/0036665 to Shima (hereinafter "Shima").

As preliminary matter, Applicant notes that item 58 appears in figure 5 of Shima and not in figure 1 as stated in the Office Action (page 2).

Applicant traverses the grounds of rejection as the reference does not disclose all the features of the claims. For example, claim 1 contains the features of a page, a page frame, and an imaginary frame that are all *on a whole of a paper* (for a non-limiting example, see Application Fig. 9). The imaginary page frame includes a page in a page frame, and the imaginary frame is part of a layout on a paper.

While the Office Action does not directly cite to which aspects of Shima correspond to specific features of claim 1, Applicant notes that in rejecting claims 2 and 7, the Office Action provides Fig. 9 of Shima as allegedly disclosing a page, a page frame,

and an imaginary frame (Office Action, page 3). Applicant submits that Fig. 9 of Shima shows a page (printing paper a3) surrounded by frames (necessary minimum printing area and expanded printing regions) outside the edge of the paper a3.

Shima is clearly directed to setting print areas *outside* the edges of a single paper (e.g., Fig. 9) as a method of marginless printing. Shima manipulates the print area (page size) to be larger than any actual *paper size* so that a printer will print on the edge of the paper (paras. 5, 8).

Unlike the claimed features, Applicant submits that Shima does not disclose a page, page frame, and an imaginary frame *on a whole of a paper*. Shima does not disclose a paper *outside* an imaginary frame, as featured in the claims, because the imaginary frame of Shima (expanded printing area) exists *outside* of the paper of Shima, contrary to the features of claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Shima does not and cannot disclose a *paper* in which a page is disposed, as featured by claim 1.

Applicant submits that claim 1 is therefore patentable over Shima, for at least the above reason. Claims 3, 5, and 6 contain similar features, and are patentable for at least the analogous reasons. The remaining rejected claims are patentable for at least the reason of their respective dependencies.

With further regard to claims 7-10, these claims feature the relative boundaries of page size and the imaginary and (non-imaginary) page frames with more particularly. Applicant respectfully submits that these aspects are not taught by Shima. For example, claim 9 describes a page outside a page frame but within an imaginary page frame, a feature of claim 7 (claim 9 is dependent on claim 7). In rejecting claim 7, the Office

Action relies on Fig. 9 of Shima as allegedly teaching this feature and, in the rejection claim 9, relies on paragraph 52 as teaching the features of claim 9. To the extent an imaginary frame is the outermost dotted line of Fig. 9 and the page is the innermost dotted line, it is clear that the page is not disposed on the paper (as is featured in claim 1, which claim 7 depends from). This is because any purported page (inner dotted line) is *outside the paper*. Applicant therefore submits that the relationships of the dependent and independent claims cannot be met by the Office Action's reliance on Fig. 9 of Shima and its supporting text, and therefore asks that the rejection be withdrawn for at least this additional reason.

***Claim Rejections: 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) - Shima + Akabane***

Claims 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Shima in view of US Publication No. 2002/0051139 to Akabane (hereinafter "Akabane").

As preliminary matter, Applicant was informed by the Examiner that the claim numbers on page 6 of the Office Action were incorrect. Claim 11 is discussed on page 5 of the Office Action, and the two claims discussed on page 6 are claims 12 and 13 (and not 11 and 12 as indicated).

Applicant traverses the grounds of rejection. Applicant first submits that Akabane fails to cure the deficiencies of Shima discussed above. Additionally, Applicant submits that Akabane, either alone or in combination, does not disclose all the features of the claims.

For example, claim 11 features a *paper image creating section* setting up a register

mark. Applicant notes that claims 11-13 are all rejected over Fig. 8 and paragraph 24 of Akabane, and Applicant submits that paragraph 62 of Akabane corresponds to Fig. 8. In paragraph 62 of Akabane, the register marks are disclosed as *pre-existing*: “A register-marked PDL document 2000 is developed into dot image 2001 by the interpreter.” Unlike the claimed feature, the registration marks of Akabane are not set up by a *paper image creating section*; they are in the pages of Akabane themselves (as shown in Fig. 8 and described in paragraph 62) in the register-marked PDL document *before* print processing (Fig. 8), assuming, *arguendo*, that the interpreter of Akabane corresponds to a paper image creating section.

Applicant therefore submits that Akabane does not disclose a paper image creating section setting up a register mark because the marks in Akabane are *pre-existing in the pages themselves*. As Akabane does not disclose the features of the claim, the claim is patentable over the references for at least this reason. Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 11, and are patentable for at least the reason of their dependency.

Applicant additionally submits that the references cannot be combined, as Shima would *serve no function* in combination with Akabane. Shima, as discussed above, deals with printing *outside* the area of a page. Akabane has registration marks *inside* the area of a page. If a page were cut on the registration marks of Akabane, *no marginless printing of Shima would need to occur* as the registration marks within the edge of the page would *serve as the margin*. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that, as the references cannot be combined, the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this additional reason.

***Conclusion***

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned Attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathan Milakovich  
Registration No. 60,376

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 17, 2009